



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

unique in our time. In the last years of Langdell's life the same keen analytical power was applied to the leading conceptions of equitable jurisdiction. The little book on Equity Pleading published many years earlier is still not much known among English lawyers, but it goes to the root of the matter far more thoroughly than any other modern treatise known to us, though probably there is no other so short."

THE LAW SCHOOL. — Principally owing to the ill health of Professor Brannan, several changes have been made in the leadership of the courses. Mr. P. L. Miller, of last year's REVIEW board, will give Bills and Notes, and Professor Beale will give Damages. Dean Ames will conduct the course in Partnership, and Mr. C. F. Dutch, of the 1905 REVIEW board, the course in Equity III. Whether Quasi-Contracts will be given will probably depend upon Professor Brannan's ability to resume his duties in the middle of the year. In the extra courses Mr. A. R. Campbell, of the 1902 REVIEW board, will lecture on New York Practice, and Mr. J. L. Stackpole, of the 1898 REVIEW board, will give a course in Patent Law. Professor Winter has returned, and will conduct classes in Voice Training and Extemporaneous Speaking.

LACK OF MUTUALITY OF REMEDY AS A DEFENSE TO SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE. — By the old orthodox rule, unless the defendant should in turn be entitled to an equitable remedy, the plaintiff took nothing by his bill for specific performance.¹ This remedy must have existed when the contract was made. Subsequent accrual of it to the defendant did not add the requisite mutuality;² subsequent loss of it to him, even by act of God,³ much less by his own laches,⁴ did not remove it. Two classes of exceptions were allowed. It was an answer to the plea that the plaintiff, though not so compellable in equity, had performed in full;⁵ likewise, that he had elected to proceed with a contract voidable at his option.⁶ Thoughtful courts have in part demolished these artificial rules. Mutuality of *equitable* remedy is no longer generally demanded,⁷ nor need it exist at the time of the bargain.⁸ A recent federal decision, however, restates the former of these discredited doctrines. *General Electric Co. v. Westinghouse Electric Co.*, 144 Fed. Rep. 458 (Circ. Ct., N. D. N. Y.).

In passing upon a bill for specific performance, certain considerations must commend themselves to the Chancellor. If the defendant has already had full performance, it no longer lies in his mouth to talk remedies. Further, if some remedy lie open to him, adequate either to assure him counter-performance or to compensate him on breach, he may not be heard to quibble over the precise form it shall take.⁷ Still less is it an

¹ Cooper v. Pena, 21 Cal. 403.

² Norris v. Fox, 45 Fed. Rep. 406.

³ Stapilton v. Stapilton, 1 Atk. 2; Moore's Adms. v. Fitz Randolph, 6 Leigh (Va.)

175.

⁴ Eastern Counties Railway Co. v. Hawkes, 5 H. L. Cas. 331.

⁵ Univ. of Des Moines v. Polk County Homestead & Trust Co., 87 Ia. 36.

⁶ See Ames, Mutuality in Specific Performance, 3 Columbia L. Rev. 1, and cases cited.

⁷ Northern Central Railway v. Walworth, 193 Pa. St. 207; Lamprey v. St. Paul & Chicago Railway, 89 Minn. 187.

⁸ Blanton v. Ky. Distilleries Co., 120 Fed. Rep. 318.